VI

A PURITAN COLONY IN MARYLAND

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY STUDIES
IN
HISTORICAL AND POLITICAL SCIENCE

HERBERT B. ADAMS, Editor

History is past Politics and Politics present History — *Freeman*

FOURTH SERIES

VI

A PURITAN COLONY
IN
MARYLAND

By DANIEL R. RANDALL, A. B.

BALTIMORE
N. MURRAY, PUBLICATION AGENT, JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY
JUNE, 1886

COPYRIGHT, 1886, BY N. MURRAY.

JOHN MURPHY & CO., PRINTERS,
BALTIMORE.

A PURITAN COLONY IN MARYLAND.

While native and foreign historians have carefully narrated the history of the Puritans of New England, hardly any notice has been taken of another Puritan band that colonized the southern provinces, a band fewer indeed in numbers but no less zealous than their New England brethren. Sufferings and trials the northern colonists doubtless had, but to those of the southern brethren must be added religious persecution, unknown to the Puritans of New England. Popular ignorance of the story of the Southern Puritans may to a degree be explained by the impossibility to most minds of associating severe, stern, blue-law Puritanism, with the loose, high-living qualities ascribed to the average Virginian or Maryland settler. To this incongruity of temperament the historian gladly leaves much of the unexplained history of the Southern Puritans; yet in the very bosom of Virginia a Puritan colony existed and waxed strong, until its very strength necessitated expulsion. The great struggle of English nonconformists for purity in the church seemed, in the early years of James I., a failure. Though spurred on and encouraged by zealous workers like Milton, who could not fail to see the evil that was creeping into the church and society at large, they yearly found their mother-country becoming more oppressive. To them the newly-found land in the west seemed to open her arms and to invite the oppressed to a refuge for religious freedom.

Puritans in Virginia, 1611.

A little band of extreme Dissenters fled from England and took refuge across the channel, while many Puritans, unnoticed, secretly took advantage of the many expeditions to the New World. Years before Pilgrims or Puritans came to the shores of Massachusetts, Puritanism was a living force in Virginia. Among the first comers there were Puritans who, for the time being, hushed religious convictions in their attempts to leave the mother-country unobserved. A small company holding the Puritan belief was undoubtedly settled in Virginia as early as 1611, when, with Sir Thomas Dale, Governor, came the so-called "Apostle," the Rev. Alexander Whittaker, under whose guidance sprang up the first Puritan Church in the New World. Whittaker dying[1] in 1616, was succeeded by the Rev. George Keith, also a non-conformist, and under these divines and the Rev. Hawte Wyatt, brother of the Governor, who came in 1621, the Puritan element was greatly strengthened, especially in Nansemond and other southern counties. In those early days of colonial enterprise, when the exertion of every settler was necessary to protect the colony from Indian marauders on the one hand and starvation on the other, little time was given to religious disputes. Orthodox and non-conformist were equally welcomed by Governor and Council. Doubtless reports from the brethren in Virginia, telling of their fortune in finding a secure retreat, where the English Archbishop's heavy hand could not be felt, came to the ears of the English separatists in Holland. When in 1620 the Pilgrim Fathers of New England turned their faces westward from the Old World to the New, their destination was Virginia, the land of peace and good-will.

---

[1] He married and baptized Pocahontas in 1614 and was drowned in the James River in 1616.

Significance of Puritan Emigration.

The Puritan emigration to America marks an important epoch in both religious and political history, securing for Englishmen and their posterity, through the daring of the first settlers, a central vantage-ground in the New World, the commanding position between the rival colonies of French and Spaniard, the Huguenot and the Jesuit. During the years 1618-21, twenty-five hundred persons came to Virginia alone, some enticed by Governor Wyatt's offers and others driven by persecution at home during the last years of Archbishop Bancroft; "and he seeing abundance more were ready to start the same voyage, obtained a proclamation, commanding them not to go without the king's license." It was this order that detained Milton and Pym, already embarked to join their brethren in Virginia, and saved England the loss of two of her noblest men. "The dissolution of the Parliament of 1629 marked the darkest hour of Puritanism, whether in England or the world at large. But it was in this their hour of despair that the Puritans won their noblest triumph. They turned toward the New World to redress the balance of the old" (Green, Short Hist. of the English People, chap. viii).

The Puritans of Virginia, with but few exceptions, sprang from the sturdy English yeomanry, from whose ranks were recruited statesmen of those days. Warrosquoyacke County, or Isle-of-Wight, finally called Norfolk County, lying on and south of the James river, was the centre of the Puritan district, and here upon broad plantations lived the future rulers of Maryland. A certain wealthy merchant of London, Edward Bennett, had obtained in 1621 a large grant of land on the Nansemond river, south of the James, and on his coming to Virginia, brought with him a considerable band of Puritan followers, who settled upon his lands and formed the nucleus of a Puritan congregation. A perfect system of local government developed under the sway of the patriarchal Bennett, while a relative, the Rev. William Bennett, was

leader in all spiritual matters. Edward's son was destined to play an important rôle in the history of Virginia and Maryland.

Growth of Puritan Settlement in Virginia.

The Puritan county grew so rapidly in population and influence that, in 1629, it was represented by two Burgesses in the Assembly. That same year Governor Harvey arrived in Virginia and immediately began to proclaim those rigorous laws, framed by Archbishop Bancroft against Dissenters, which, though standing upon the statute-books, had hitherto remained a dead letter with Virginia governors. Harvey's action was merely formal. His chief end was to secure the friendship of the all-powerful Bishop and the disenfranchisement of Roman Catholics. Indeed so popular was the Puritan element with the Governor, that about this time a Captain Basse, of that persuasion, was instructed by him to invite any Puritan settlers from Plymouth to come and settle on Delaware Bay, then within the limits of Virginia. This invitation was not accepted, nor have we any trace of permanent settlement among Puritans in Virginia by New England colonists, though many went from Virginia to Massachusetts. By an Act of February 24, 1631, the government of Virginia became for the first time openly intolerant. This Act prescribes: "that there be a uniformity throughout this colony both in substance and circumstances to the canons and constitution of the Church of England." To what extent religious intolerance was carried through this ordinance is unknown, but it doubtless caused the withdrawal, at least from public view, of the Puritan divines then officiating in Virginia. The elders of the churches continued to conduct services in private houses, yet the want of spiritual leaders was sorely felt, and a tendency appeared among the congregations to break up and scatter. At Nansemond, Bennett conducted services, and, though the church was there more compact,

yet it was clearly seen that outside aid was essential to its continued welfare.

Puritan Ministers from Massachusetts.

Their only hope lay in their more fortunate brethren in Massachusetts, and, to seek aid from them, Mr. Philip Bennett, one of the Nansemond elders, was sent in May, 1641, bearing letters and a petition signed by seventy-one persons, to Governor Winthrop and the Church in Boston. Bennett arrived in Boston and on lecture day his letters were openly read. A day was set apart "to seek God in it and agree upon those who could be spared from the churches in New England"[1] to preach in such a distant quarter. Those churches which were blessed with two divines, with commendable zeal unhesitatingly offered the one who could be easiest spared to prosecute in Virginia the hallowed work. Of those who were suggested, Mr. Phillips of Watertown, Mr. Thompson of Braintree, and Mr. Miller of Rowley were elected by the assembled magistrates. Mr. Miller, however, declined because of bodily infirmity, and Mr. Phillips deemed it inadvisable that he should make such a change at his age. A Puritan elder and co-laborer with Mr. Phillips at Watertown, Mr. Knowles, took his place, and Mr. James of New Haven was chosen to succeed Mr. Miller. With blessings from the churches upon their labors in Virginia the party, under Bennett's guidance, embarked from Narragansett during the winter of 1642–3. The little vessel with its precious freight was caught in a storm and driven upon Hell Gate rocks and its passengers, though escaping with their lives, were rudely treated by the Dutch. Nothing daunted, the party procured a new ship and arrived in the James River eleven weeks after their original embarkation.

---

[1] Winthrop's Journal, Vol. II., pp. 93-4.

Beginning of Persecution in Virginia.

Meanwhile new hands held the reins of government in the Commonwealth of Virginia. Bigoted Gov. Berkeley and his more bigoted chaplain, Harrison, were zealous in their persecution of sectaries. "Here," says Winthrop, "they found very loving and liberal entertainment and friends, and were bestowed in several places, not by the Governor, but by some well-disposed persons who desired their company." Their letters of introduction from Winthrop to Berkeley, though duly presented, brought them no good, and into their fields of labor they went, glad to escape from Jamestown and the unfriendly Governor. Within six months after their arrival Messrs. James and Knowles were compelled to leave the country by an Act of Assembly passed that spring, but "Thompson, of tall and comely presence," remained longer. "Messrs. James and Knowles returned the following summer and were able to tell, and the letters confirmed it, that God had given abundant success and lustre to their ministry."[1] Though the medicinal properties of Virginia waters were then unknown, Thompson wrote back to the elders in Boston, "that being a very melancholic man and of crazy body, he found his health so repaired and his spirit so enlarged, as he had not been since his arrival in New England." His efforts were well rewarded and the growing numbers and importance of the Puritan element provoked two enactments of the Assembly this year against that sect. The Book of Common Prayer was insisted upon as the foundation of all religious services within the Province, and all non-conformists who taught other principles were to be expelled. But still Thompson labored on among his many converts. Of these, Daniel Godkin or Gookin, the wayward son of a good old Puritan of that name, was the most incorrigible. However, the Rev. Thompson's public teaching and private expostulation con-

[1] Records of Massachusetts, Vol. VII., (1642).

verted him so completely from his evil ways that the good people were a little skeptical of his sincerity, and Daniel left the home of his fathers, changed his name to Gookin, and went to Boston, there to signalize himself by his good works. Mather celebrated Thompson's work and particularly this wonderful conversion by writing thereon a poem, of which I quote a stanza:

> "A constellation of great converts there
> Shone round him, and his heavenly glory wear;
> Godkin was one of them; by Thompson's pains
> Christ and New England a dear Godkin gains."

Effect of the Indian Massacre.

Indian barbarity is not often regarded in the light of public benefaction, yet the massacre on Good Friday, 1644, in which many Virginians were killed, was an epoch-making event, a red-letter day in the calendar of the Nansemond Puritans. The hitherto persecuting Rev. Thomas Harrison saw an omen in the calamity which befel the Established Church, and, leaving Jamestown and his office of chaplain to his Excellency the Governor, he went down into the wilds of Nansemond a zealous Puritan, to aid in building that church which he had before endeavored to wreck. Berkley tried moral persuasion upon him in hopes of bringing him back, but failing in this course, he swore at him vigorously. Harrison was as zealous now in preaching as before he had been in denouncing Puritan doctrines. His light was in no way hid under a bushel, but publicly in every quarter he preached and converted until his success became unbounded. The Governor was exasperated at the man's audacity and instigated the Assembly to pass another act of intolerance, November 3, 1647.—"Upon divers informations presented to this Assembly, against several ministers for their neglect and refractory refusing, after warning given them to read the Common Prayer . . . for future remedy thereof, be it

enacted by the Governor, Council and Burgesses of this grand Assembly that, ministers in their several cures, throughout the colony do duly upon every Sabbath day read such prayers as are appointed and prescribed unto them by the said Book of Common Prayer; and be it further enacted as a penalty to such as have neglected or shall continue to neglect their duty therein, that no parishioner shall be compelled either by distress or otherwise to pay any manner of tythes of duties to any unconformist as aforesaid." The Puritans were represented in this Assembly, and Richard Bennett until this year had been a member of the Council, but the passage of this Act and its necessary consequences widened the breach between the churches and we hear no more of their connection with the Virginia government, until Richard Bennett appears in 1652 as Governor of the Commonwealth.

Continued Persecution.

If the penalties prescribed in the Act of 1647 had been the only ones inflicted or attempted, the history of the Puritan colony would have been greatly modified, and perhaps rendered far less interesting, but the Act of 1643 was still in force and through its provisions Governor Berkley undertook severer modes of persecution. "First their Pastor was banished, next their other Teachers, many by their informations were clapt up in prison, then generally disarmed, though surrounded by hostile Indians and lastly put in a condition of banishment."[1] Harrison and Thompson were compelled to leave the colony and Mr. Durand and Richard Bennett, the elders of the Nansemond Church, soon followed. Harrison went to Boston and consulted the magistrates and his firm friend, Governor Winthrop, whether the Church thus persecuted should abandon its position, and, if so, whither it should go. Harrison is reported as saying, that many of the

[1] Hammond's "Virginia and Maryland," 1659.

Virginia Assembly were favorably disposed toward the introduction of Puritanism on equal terms with the Church of England and by conjecture that one thousand people were of like mind.

At this point the Puritan Church had undoubtedly reached its maximum in point of numbers, but its size has been greatly under-estimated by later writers. Not more than one third of the Church emigrated and they must have numbered at least three hundred. Harrison conceived it a good scheme to accept the invitation of Capt. Wm. Sayle, and, under his leadership, to found a Puritan colony in the Bahama islands, where religious toleration was enforced by an Act of Parliament; but the Virginia "Church was very orthodox and zealous for the truth," and would not act until advice had been received from Boston. Winthrop dissuaded him from this change, saying, "as long as they could live in Virginia, even on tolerable terms, they had better be not hasty in moving, especially as there was prospect of a large harvest."[1] Thwarted in his endeavors to move the Puritans and unable to return to Virginia, Harrison returned to England and entered as chaplain the service of Richard Cromwell. His little flock did not forget their leader and resolutely petitioned the Council of State in England that he be allowed to return, complaining that Governor Berkeley's act was unlawful and harsh in the extreme. In October, 1649, the answer came, but too late to be of effectual service. The Governor was instructed, inasmuch as Mr. Harrison was reported a man of unblamable conversation and had been banished simply for non-conformance, to allow him to return. Berkeley could not have been ignorant that the use of the Book of Common Prayer was then prohibited by an Act of Parliament. We can picture the old Governor laughing in his sleeve when he received these orders. His commission had been granted by Charles I., of sainted memory, and confirmed by his son,

[1] Winthrop, I., p. 334; Hubbard, pp. 522-4; Johnson, III., c. 11.

Charles II., when in exile at Breda, upon condition of loyalty to the Stuart cause. We may safely say that Parliament's orders would have been disregarded by the Governor even if the Puritans had been still in Virginia; but their emigration made unnecessary any further consideration of the matter.

Mr. Thompson returned to Boston and there performed other miracles, recorded by the New England annalists, equaling that of Gookin's conversion. His woful tale of the hardships and oppression of his congregations in Virginia convinced their brethren in Massachusetts that the church in Virginia was as a thing of the past, gone and to be forgotten; and Hubbard in fact states that the congregations had dissolved and that their members were either dead or dispersed. In this view, however, New England people were far from correct. Durand and Bennett with their families fled to Maryland and settled at Newtown Hundred, near St. Mary's city. In this unhappy condition, without leaders, disarmed and persecuted, not knowing whether to stay on poor terms in Virginia or seek other homes, we leave for a moment the Puritan Church and review briefly the condition of Maryland, their future home, and its history up to this period.

Early Settlements upon Kent Island.

Upon that great tract of country belonging to the original grant of Virginia, from which Maryland was carved by the grant of 1632 to George Calvert, there was at first but one settlement. This was upon Kent Island in the Chesapeake Bay, a settlement planted by Protestants from Virginia, in 1631, under William Claybourne, for the purpose of trade with Indians.[1] On the arrival of Lord Baltimore's colony

[1] I have omitted referring to or discussing the question whether Claybourne was a Puritan, as many claim, or whether his colonists were of the Virginia Puritans. Certain it is, that there always existed close relations between Kent Isle and Providence.

in 1634 to settle the land which the charter alleged to be "uncultivated and unplanted, and inhabited by barbarous tribes of heathens," contention immediately arose over the possession of and right to the Isle of Kent. Claybourne claimed it as given to him by royal grant and as a part of Virginia, having representatives in that Assembly the year before Calvert even applied for his charter. In spite of secret aid from the Virginia Council, Claybourne lost[1] his case. His authority "without interruption to trade and traffique in all seas, coastes, rivers &c in or nere or about those parts of America," of course fell, with his trading posts and good-will, to Baltimore, and Claybourne fled, branded as a traitor and pirate.

Two Classes of Settlers in Maryland.

Begun in strife over an unimportant portion of country, Baltimore's colony was in no way prosperous. The colonists were divided into two classes—one, the friends of the Proprietor, feudal lords, owning large manors; the other, a dependent class, often of good stock, yet economically enslaved to the landlords for terms of years. Discontent was rife between the two classes within the colony. Without, Virginia, though commanded to respect Lord Baltimore's rights, had little inclination to do so, grieved at the loss of "two-thirds" of her territory. In England, the Maryland colony was complained of by Parliament to Charles I., because he had allowed another colony to be founded "contrary in interest and affection to the Established Church." Baltimore's situation was truly perplexing. His ideal colony was complained of at home and abroad and was yielding no return for his immense outlay in founding it. In some way new life must

[1] He was supported throughout by the King and by the Virginia Council who were so ordered, and who were so exasperated with Calvert that they forbade traffic or aid to the colonists of Maryland.

be introduced and inducements must be offered to thrifty settlers, so as to bring Maryland into repute and relieve the proprietary from a position of financial dependence upon his father-in-law, Earl Arundel.[1]

Lord Baltimore's Colonial Policy.

In the hardy and prosperous settlements of New England he thought he saw the coveted element that would build up his plantations and his threatened fortune, men who would gladly leave the bleak and barren north for his milder climate and more fertile country. For this purpose in 1643 he wrote to Captain Gibbons, then in Boston, though once a Marylander,[2] offering him, and any one who would accompany him and settle in Terra Mariæ, not only religious toleration but also broad acres of land. "But," says Winthrop, "our captain had no mind to further his desire therein nor had any one of our people temptation therein." Failing in this quarter, Baltimore issued almost yearly more inviting Conditions of Plantation to English or Irish settlers, whereby adventurers would receive large tracts of land for themselves and a per caput allowance for all persons induced by them to settle.

These attractive offers were accepted in a few cases by Virginians who wished to be free from the exactions of Governor Berkley, but this immigration was soon cut short by an Act of the Virginia Assembly of 1645, forbidding any colonist to leave that province for Maryland without permission. Some emigrants came from the mother country, but, with Proprietor, Governor and Council of Roman Catholic faith, Protestant colonization could hardly be expected upon a large

---

[1] His poverty may be judged by the fact, that Wm. Arundel, Esq., petitions Parliament for a writ of *ne exeat* against Baltimore, who was about to go to Maryland. Lord's Journal, IV., 671.

[2] Moved to Boston about 1641, and became Major Gen. of N. E.; afterward, Jan. 1651, commissioned by Lord Baltimore as a Councillor and as Admiral of Maryland.

scale. On the other hand, Baltimore's expulsion of the Jesuits somewhat angered the Romish Church against him and his schemes. A civil war between the two original claimants to Kent Island, commonly known as Claybourne's and Ingle's rebellion, together with Leonard Calvert's death, and the necessity of a successor in the Governor's chair, convinced the Proprietor of the advisability of a change in the administration of the province.[1] William Stone, a Protestant of Northampton County, Virginia, who had, however, for two years been living in Maryland, was commissioned Governor, because, as his commission states, "our trusty and well-beloved Wm. Stone now or late of Northampton County in Virginia, esquire, hath undertaken in some short time to procure five hundred people of British or Irish descent to come from other places and plant and reside within our said Province of Maryland for the advancement of our colony there." In August, 1648, Stone took his oath of office with the special clause "not to molest in particular any Roman Catholic." He immediately proceeded to collect his required quota of settlers, but with little success that year, as the Records show him to have applied for land for only six persons.

Puritans of Virginia Invited to Maryland.

This year, 1648, witnessed, as before stated, the flight of the Puritan elders Bennett and Durand from Virginia into Maryland, and doubtless they suggested to Stone, perhaps before his appointment, the probability of an immigration of the whole Nansemond Church, if kindly invited. They numbered perhaps three hundred persons and many others of like

[1] The Lords of Plantation, in a report, Dec. 1645, advised the appointment of a Protestant Governor, and upon their advice and certain petitions of London merchants and a complaint of widow Mary Ford, the House of Lords passed a bill nullifying Baltimore's charter. It never passed the Commons. Md. Archives, III.

faith would doubtless follow them to Maryland. Here was an extraordinary chance for the Governor to fulfil his economic obligations at a small cost and Stone was not slow in his overtures. Personally, or through their elders in Maryland, Stone invited the oppressed Church in Virginia to emigrate, guaranteeing them free exercise of their religion, local government, and grants of land under his lordship's Conditions of Plantation.

It is not surprising that Governor Stone, in his excitement and pleasure at the idea of bringing in and establishing such a large body of colonists, should have made offers and promised liberties hardly reconcilable with the Proprietor's feudal ideas. It is even less a surprise that he should have denied many of these liberties a few years later, when the prize was now in his hands and the Lord Proprietor showed unwillingness to allow such privileges. The Governor's offers were not immediately accepted; for the Puritans remembered the advice of their Boston friends in regard to removal. Change would be expensive and the newly offered refuge might prove more beset with danger under Roman Catholic rule, than their old home in Virginia under Berkley, unless the freedom and liberty of English subjects, offered by Governor Stone, were duly confirmed by the "Absolute Lord and Proprietor" of Terra Mariae. Stone assured them that in Maryland they would find a land of liberty and toleration, and pointed as a precedent to Lord Baltimore's gracious invitation to their New England brethren in 1643. Not yet thoroughly convinced, the Puritans of Virginia addressed a letter to his Lordship in England asking for a confirmation of Governor Stone's propositions. The answer either never arrived or was delayed until they had firmly established themselves in their new homes.

The passage of an Act by the Virginia Assembly denouncing the execution of Charles I., proclaiming his son rightful king and making it treason to think or utter anything against the house of Stuart or in favor of a Puritan Parliament, was the

final straw that decided the fate of the Puritans in Virginia. They determined to depart for Maryland and settle upon those lands lying north of the Patuxent river, already granted to Governor Stone for his five hundred colonists, trusting to the Proprietor's probable sanction of Stone's promises. This section of Maryland had not been visited by settlers, though perhaps by traders. It was at this time the hunting grounds of the Susquehannock Indians.

Beginning of Puritan Migration.

The emigration from the Nansemond began during the spring or early summer of 1649. "With great cost, labor and danger did we remove ourselves, bringing ourselves and estates," they said, in a later petition. Their immigration continued throughout the year. Out from the James river and up the broad Chesapeake the Virginia Puritans sailed, viewing the wild country on either hand, until they arrived at or near the mouth of the beautiful river now known as the Severn. Here the first contingent landed and hither afterward the majority of the Puritans came. Local associations with mother England, whence some of the settlers had so recently come, inspired them to call this river the Severn. Thankful for preservation and happy at finding a home, peaceful and secure, they named the whole section of country, "Providence." Nowhere in the settlement of Virginia Puritans do we find local names derived from their old homes in Virginia. No Nansemond, Jamestown, nor Norfolk was revived in Maryland. This colony was a new Canaan and the memories of Virginia, sad indeed to many, were to be forgotten. A small band from Bennett's plantation at Nansemond, numbering perhaps ten families, were the first Puritans to arrive at their new home. Under the leadership of Richard Bennett, they settled on what is now known as "Greenberry's Point," at the mouth of the Severn. Strangers in a strange land, ignorant of the treatment they might receive from white men

or Indians, they determined, for the present, to form a close community for mutual protection. A tract of two hundred and fifty acres was surveyed into lots of fifteen acres, each settler taking one and Bennett all that were left. Finding their security in no way endangered, the scattering settlers soon transferred these lots, one by one, to Bennett, and within five years he owned the original tract as a single plantation. The original owners of the "town-lands at Seaverne" moved away to rural plantations such as later and more adventurous comers had already secured. The original existence of "town-lands" upon the Severn should not be regarded as decisive evidence that there was anything more than the germ of a town planted upon Greenberry's Point. Whatever the character of the original community, settled there for a brief period and for mutual protection, it soon dispersed and left no town behind. Greenberry's Point was not the municipal beginning of Annapolis. That community was a subsequent concentration of Puritan life derived from other sources than the original plantation. As the Puritans came up from Virginia, they took unoccupied lands lying on the Bay or its tributaries and soon the settlement of "Providence" included a line of plantations extending from Herring Bay to the Magothy River. Trees were felled and log huts built, small indeed in size and rude, yet sufficient for a defense against the winter's cold soon to follow. They had no ready-built Indian village nor cleared lands such as the first planters of Maryland enjoyed through friendship with the natives. Puritan labor was strictly that of pioneers, and through such beginnings they were better prepared to build a state than were their predecessors at St. Mary's.

Puritan Meeting-House.

The Puritan system of church government, always a powerful means of union, was transplanted to Maryland. Durand and Bennett again occupied their accustomed places

as elders in the Church and as leaders in civil affairs. These men secured large grants of land for themselves, and, the disorder accompanying the removal from Virginia having subsided, the leaders looked about for a central site whereon to build their meeting-house, the Acropolis of every Puritan settlement. By joint contribution of work and materials the first meeting-house was erected near the Magothy river upon land adjoining that of Elder Durand. Mr. Philip Thomas, then a strict Puritan but later a leader of the Friends, lived on the premises and guarded the sanctuary.

Within a year after its arrival, the Puritan colony of Providence had perfected its administration to a greater extent than was allowed in Virginia even in the best days. "They sat down joyfully, followed their vocations cheerfully, trade increased in their province and divers others were by this encouraged and invited over from Virginia." Additions were continually made to their numbers from brethren left in Virginia and, in 1650, Robert Brooke, a Puritan of means and influence in England, was granted a tract of 2,000 acres lying on the Patuxent river. Here he settled with a family of ten and about forty dependents, possibly all Puritans, but not all of the orthodox stamp, men whom he had brought out with him from England. By his charter Brooke was made commander of Charles County, that year erected, and given absolute feudal supremacy over his colony.

Thus, with borders adjoining, there grew up two distinct Puritan settlements, having few things in common and indeed often opposed to one another in times of civil discord. The system of church government which was so prominent among the settlers of Providence was entirely wanting among the settlers of Charles county. In its place a system of feudal laws and of manorial courts was instituted. Consequently the settlement in Charles county lost in a few years the distinct characteristics of a Puritan colony, because the more orthodox party among them seem to have soon removed into "Providence" and the remainder, perhaps the larger body,

intermingled with the older colonists of St. Mary's whose borders touched theirs upon the other side.

During the year 1650 the Puritans of Providence addressed a letter to their old friends the Council of State, in England, a letter which was presented in October of that year to the Council by Henry Wallis, Esq. Its object would seem to have been to learn from those in authority in England the true course to be pursued toward Lord Baltimore and his government in Maryland.[1] To all appearances, Governor Stone was pleased with his colony and made frequent visits to it during the transition period of settlement. When the colony was fully established, during the winter of 1649–50, he invited it to send burgesses to the Assembly soon to meet. Up to this time the Puritans had not come in contact with the older settlers of Maryland. Moved by their natural religious conservatism and by ideas already fixed in regard to their proper position in the Province, they declined the Governor's offer. The idea which prompted their reply was this: the Puritans had determined, upon their migration to Maryland, to found an independent community with its own local government, free from the trials and conflicts attendant upon participation in the general government of the Province. Their intention was to erect, upon the banks of the Chesapeake, a province established by the aid of God and bearing the reverential name of "Providence." This idea we shall find cropping out continually, although never realized.

---

[1] "The Council having received the petitions and papers presented by Mr. Henry Wallis on behalf of divers well affected persons of the Isle of Providence in Marieland think fitt to declare that as the parliament have already expressed themselves sensible of the conditions of the plantations abroad depending upon this common-wealth . . . will proceed to care for the welfare of those plantations and of such there as reteine their Integrity and good affection to the Parliament and present government, &c." Oct. 3, 1650, Vol. 38, p. 78, P. R. O. (printed in Md. Archives, Vol. III.)

Puritans in Politics.

Upon the urgent request made in person by Governor Stone the Puritans at last yielded, and in his presence the freemen unanimously chose George Puddington and William Cox, two of their brethren, to represent them and sent them down in a boat to the seat of government at St. Mary's. The Assembly met April 5, but adjourned because the Puritans had not come. On their arrival the next day, one of the two, Mr. Cox, was chosen speaker of the Lower House. The Protestant element in the Assembly, hitherto in the minority, looked upon the arrival of the Puritans as a happy event, foreshadowing their future strength if not supremacy in the rule of the Province. Hence at this Assembly they were particularly energetic in declaring their perfect happiness and peace in religious matters and voted extra revenues for the benefit of their Lord Proprietor. In both of these measures the Roman Catholics stood aloof. "Providence" was erected into a county and named, in grateful recognition, Ann Arundel, after the wife of Lord Baltimore, lately deceased. The erection of a county had hitherto been considered the prerogative of the Proprietor, and indeed was afterward so deemed. Yet, in this instance, many circumstances tended toward this seemingly unwarrantable act. Governor Stone had seen the indisposition of the Puritans to a too close alliance with the administration of the Province, and as no outward sign of recognition had as yet come from the Proprietor, he determined to act upon his own authority and make Providence a county in the administrative system of Maryland. Baltimore must have tacitly approved of Stone's action, for he nowhere speaks of the matter.

The Puritans thus became citizens of Maryland and responsible for any breach of the law of the province. Their original plan of a *civitas in civitate* was merged in a Maryland county and Governor Stone could rest assured that the entire colony, Catholic and Protestant, would henceforth have some

degree of permanency. Lord Baltimore's oath of allegiance, which all persons receiving lands had doubtless taken, was objected to by some of the leading Puritans, because of the expression "Absolute Lord," deemed by them too omnipotent in tone for a man who was himself the subject of a Puritan government in England. The form of the oath was consequently modified by the Assembly and the offensive term omitted, apparently without much discussion, but it was at a later period the cause of much trouble. Fifty pounds of tobacco per diem was the salary fixed for the Burgesses. The sheriff's account reads as follows:

"Charges to be collected from Annrundell County.

To Mr. Puddington " Mr. Cox	for 37 days apiece at 50lb per day	3700
Boats, hands and wages		600
		4300"

Puritan Independence.

The Puritans acquitted themselves so well in public life that Governor Stone visited them in "Providence," now called Ann Arundel County, the following July and perfected the county government. He appointed Mr. Lloyd the commander, and under him seven justices, who served but for one year. With any three of them he could hold court. Their jurisdiction extended over all cases, but an appeal could be had to the Provincial Court in cases involving £20 or its equivalent, 2,000 pounds of tobacco. The commander was also empowered to grant lands to settlers within his county under the Conditions of Plantation. Unfortunately no records of this early county-court have as yet come to light, but we have some insight into its mode of working from cases appealed thence to the higher court. The Puritans, though well treated at the Assembly, were apparently satisfied with the taste they had had of political life. They had now their own sufficient system of local government and they perceived that

the only results produced by participation in the political life of the Province were increased taxation and civic intercourse with those for whom they had no sympathies. Moreover reports from England confirmed the triumph of Cromwell, and with him of Puritanism wherever it existed. The revolt in Ireland, its suppression and the execution of its leaders convinced them that a Roman Catholic peer, a friend of the late king, would hardly retain his "absolute lordship" with a Puritan Parliament, and that Lord Baltimore's charter was endangered. However foolish this theory appeared to Baltimore, it was based upon fact and was subsequently confirmed by the action of the home government.

The Puritans were summoned by the Governor to send Burgesses to an Assembly to meet in March, 1651. A letter of declination was drawn up by Mr. Lloyd, signed by the Puritan freemen and sent to Stone, assigning as their reason for not sending delegates the danger that would ensue to them upon the expected revocation of the Charter of Maryland. No action was taken in the matter by the government in Maryland, but Lord Baltimore was fully informed of the same and he sent a letter of twelve pages of unpunctuated manuscript relating to the Puritans' audacious action of asserting local independence. The fears and surmises of the men of Ann Arundel, runs the message, are totally unfounded; their action is rebellious in character and the consequences of such rebellion against their true Lord and Proprietor will be severe if they persist therein. When we consider, in addition to the fact of Puritan rule in England, that by commission of Charles II., then an exile in Breda, Lord Baltimore had been removed and his successor appointed as Proprietor of Maryland, we shall perceive that the fears and political motives of the Puritans had some foundation. Charles had been moved to the revocation of Calvert's rights by news from his constant ally in Virginia, Governor Berkley, who informed him of the refuge given by Maryland to "all kinds of sectaries and schismatics and ill-affected persons, adherents to the rebels in England who for this cause had been driven from Virginia."

Revolution in Virginia and Maryland.

An open display of friendship to the Stuart cause soon lost for Virginia her independence. News of loyal proclamations there and also in Maryland came to the ears of Parliament and means were immediately taken to suppress royalistic feeling by reducing both Provinces to the authority of Parliament. Claybourne, the life-long enemy of Baltimore, was then held in high esteem in Virginia. He and Bennett, a member of both colonies, but an enemy of Berkley, with two others, Stagge and Dennis, were appointed Commissioners to effect the reduction.[1] The first two would necessarily be diligent officers in their respective provinces. Early in the year 1652, Governor Berkley and the province of Virginia, after some show of resistance to the Commissioners of Parliament, were compelled to acknowledge the Commonwealth, and the officers of Parliament then proceeded in a small boat to Maryland to carry out the same design. During March, 1652, they reached St. Mary's and, at an interview with Governor Stone and his Council, proposed that the then existing administration "should continue conforming themselves to the laws of the Commonwealth in point of government only, not infringing the Lord Baltimore's just rights." This proposition the Governor refused as inconsistent with the charter of the province. The Commissioners then proceeded to form a provisional government of six councilmen with Robert Brooke, the Puritan of Patuxent, as President.[2] The Puritans of Providence were not represented, nor is there found any

---

[1] Their instructions are dated Sept. 26, 1651. Capt. Edward Curtis succeeded Dennis.

[2] In November, 1652, the Commissioners made their proclamation, viz.: (1) Writs are to be issued in the name of the Keepers of England and signed by one or more of the Council; (2) Both Council and colonists must subscribe to the Engagement; (3) The Council are to govern the Province. Of these, two were of the old and four newly-appointed members of the Council.

evidence to show that they took sides in the matter or were at all influential in bringing about this first Puritan revolution of Maryland. The Secretary of the Province, Mr. Hatton, who held the only remunerative office, was allowed to appoint a successor and two of Stone's Council were retained in the new body. Three months later we find that Stone and his Council had conveniently banished their troublesome consciences and were again in power, in entire conformity with the Commonwealth of England and the laws proclaimed by it.[1] Maryland was now Puritan in theory and administration, if not in officers.

Indian Policy.

Desire for peace and friendly relations with the Indians, in whose very midst the Puritans had settled, pointed them out as the most fitting persons to conclude a treaty with their savage neighbors and settle definitely the boundaries of the Indian hunting ground. The isolation of the scattered plantations of "Providence" and their want of ammunition, their supply of which before their migration Governor Berkley had appropriated, made their settlements open to attack; indeed one of their number had been murdered by Indians the year before. On the 5th of July, 1652, the five leaders of the Providence colony, designated as the committee on Indian negotiations, met the Indian chiefs, as tradition tells, under the branches of a poplar, still standing, grand and majestic, upon the College Green at Annapolis. There the treaty was

[1] In the Commissions to Claybourne, Bennett, Dennis, and Stagge, by an order of Parliament, September 26th, 1651, sent them, are these orders:—"you shall cause and see all the several acts of Parliament against kingship and the house of lords to be received and published; as also all the acts for establishing the Book of Common Prayer and for subscribing to the engagement . . . you (or any two of you) to administer an oath to the inhabitants or planters there, to be true and faithful to the Commonwealth of England as it is now established without a king and house of lords." Thurloe's State Papers.

drawn up and signed, the chiefs meanwhile enjoying the hospitality of their Puritan friends.[1] Hardly had negotiations closed with the Indians of the Western Shore, when a petition was received by the Governor from across the Bay, requesting an immediate hostile advance upon the Indians of the Eastern shore. Governor Stone readily consented and appointed as commander-in-chief of the expedition, William Fuller, one of the Puritan peace-commissioners who had just concluded the treaty upon the river Severn. Preparations on a very large scale were now upon the point of completion and numerous proclamations (some cruel in the extreme), were already issued touching the treatment of captives and the division of spoil, when Capt. Fuller notified the Governor of the natural unwillingness of the Puritans to engage in such an expedition. Not only because of the prospect of cold and hunger likely to be endured in a winter's campaign, but chiefly because of the treaty lately concluded and the knowledge of the Western Shore Indians of the intended attack did the Puritans make their protest. Fuller proposed in conclusion that he resume again his more peaceful garb and be allowed to cross the bay and settle the matter alone in a more friendly way. Governor Stone, confessing the many dangers that would attend such an undertaking, postponed the attack and disbanded the troops which had begun to assemble. He ascribed the action of the Puritans to disaffection and virtual rebellion against the government. A week after Fuller's reply, Mr. Lloyd, the Commander of Providence, was removed from office on unfounded and trivial charges, and then began a series of petty prosecutions against

---

[1] "These several articles were solemnly and mutually debated and concluded at the River of Severne in the Province of Maryland by Richard Bennett, Edward Lloyd, Wm. Fuller, Thos. Marsh and Leonard Strong .... and were fully ratified, done and confirmed by several presents, gifts and tokens of friendship mutually given, received and accepted on both sides." Council Records.

the Puritan colony resulting two years later in Stone's overthrow.

Doubtless he had been instigated to his course by the orders of the Proprietor who chafed under the curb which Parliament had put upon his absolute authority over Maryland. The commissioners had retired to Virginia and an opportunity was thus given to Stone to weaken the Puritan power by removing them from office. Moreover, as the Assemblies had been made triennial, and the Provincial Court adjourned from month to month on the plea that no orders had been received from England touching the welfare of the Province, no opportunity was given for bringing the two factions together to effect a reconciliation. Robert Brooke was the next to feel the Governor's animosity, and in accordance with the Proprietor's instructions he was removed from the Council. During December, 1653, Governor Stone, instigated by a letter from the Proprietor, and in direct violation of his agreement with the Puritans at their coming, proclaimed that all persons should take the first oath of fidelity to his Lordship within three months or forfeit their lands.

A general meeting of the freemen of the Providence community was called at their meeting-house, presided over by Mr. Lloyd. A petition was addressed to Lord Baltimore and another to the Council of State; neither of these was answered. Without friends in England, and with their representatives in the provincial government removed, the Puritans had now but one resort. At least the commissioners, then in Virginia, would aid them, and to Bennett and Claybourne they sent an eloquent appeal for justice. They complained of the actions of Stone and his Council. The petition was signed "Ed. Lloyd and 77 persons of the house-keepers and freemen, Inhabitants," and was dated, Severn River, Jan. 3, 1653/4. "Nor can we be persuaded in our consciences," they write, after narrating their grievances, "by any light of God or engagement upon us to take such an oath, nor do we see by what lawful authority such an oath with such extreme penal-

ties can by his Lordship be exacted of us, who are free subjects of the Commonwealth of England and have taken the engagement to them." The petition concludes with the request for advice in this their hour of need. Advice was given them in the reply from Virginia. The commissioners promised neither aid nor hopes of aid. They said, "Simply obey the laws of the Commonwealth of England as true and loyal English citizens and that is all that can be desired or expected."

Puritan Conquest of Maryland.

This reply was evidently reported to the Governor, who, in return, called the Puritans "factious and seditious fellows" and prophesied trouble for them in the future.[1] A petition similar to that of the Providence Puritans had been addressed, March 1, 1654, by the inhabitants of Patuxent and was subscribed by Richard Preston and sixty others. The commissioners' answer, March 12, was to both of these parties with advice to both. Quickly following this, and again in violation of the agreement by which he had acquired his power,[2] Stone sent notices to all officers to issue writs and warrants no longer in the name of the Commonwealth, but in that of the Lord Proprietor, and this action quickly brought up the commissioners from Virginia. All peaceful measures or agreements were now rejected by Stone and open violence was threatened against the persons of the commissioners. The Puritans prepared for war. A small force from the neighborhood and the Severn gathered at the Patuxent and, under Bennett's leadership, proceeded without bloodshed to St. Mary's, and

---

[1] "In the year 1654, from instructions received from England, Stone and Hatton with the Popish Councillors rose up against the Reducement and placed the old Popish council in power who published proclamations full of scathing terms against the people of Providence and the Commissioners and this was read at Providence in the church meeting." Babylon's Fall, by L. Strong.

[2] Note to page 26.

the second conquest of Maryland was completed in July, 1654. Puritan supremacy was again everywhere acknowledged. Stone resigned his office, as he states, "solely to avoid the effusion of blood and the ruin of the Province," and a new government was formed, consisting of a board or council of ten men, an exact counterpart of the Council of State in England.[1] It was a Puritan victory, and in consequence the administrative power of the colony fell largely into the hands of Puritans. Of the council, four were the leaders of the Providence community, three from Patuxent and three from St. Mary's.

Orders were now given by the Commissioners to summon an Assembly for the following October, but no Roman Catholic was to have the right of franchise, nor any one who had borne arms against the Parliament in war.[2] The responsibility for this order by the Commissioners has been charged to the Providence colony, and by those historians who deign to mention the Puritans is pronounced the only blot on our colonial records. In the present enlightened age such an order would indeed be unpardonable, but we must remember that it was but the echo of an Act of the English Parliament of one year previous,[3] and was in express accordance with the commands of Parliament to her Commissioners in Maryland and Virginia.[4] Let us bear in mind too that, apart from any personal wish of the Proprietor and apart from the Act of 1649 establishing toleration, proceeding as that had done from the will of the people, religious freedom, up to this

---

[1] Seven more men were added to the Council in 1655.

[2] A Proclamation of the Commissioners was issued by Bennett and Claybourne July 22, 1654. It assigns as the reasons for the overthrow of the existing government; (1) The issue of writs in the name of the Proprietor; (2) Displacement of members of the Council; (3) Imposition of oaths upon the inhabitants, contrary and inconsistent with their original engagements.

[3] Act of December 16, 1653.

[4] See note, page 27.

time, was a political and economic necessity in Maryland. If, in the early days of the colony, the Roman Catholics were superior in numbers—still a debated question—their charter forbade intolerance, and Protestant Virginia would have been a standing menace to any attempt at intolerance.

As years wore on, the rival parties became more and more unequal and the influx, from 1649 to 1654, of perhaps a thousand colonists of Protestant persuasion, threw the balance of power largely in their favor. The loyalty of Cecilius Calvert and of his friends in Maryland to the Stuart cause was now a stumbling-block in the way of their progress, for the home government was Puritan throughout. After the year 1650, the Roman Catholic power in the Province grew steadily less. Maryland became largely Protestant in population. Its government, as a colony of Great Britain, remained Protestant. Following the Puritan revolution we hear of no bloodshed or acts of injustice by the victorious party.

Puritan Legislation.

In October, 1654, "a full and lawful Assembly" was held at Patuxent. It comprised the ten Councillors and six Burgesses from St. Mary's and the neighborhood. This Assembly bore a close resemblance to the English Council of State. It sat as one house and acted as one legislative body. One of the first acts of this session was to change the name of the Puritan County from Ann Arundel back to Providence, "by which it was first called by those settling there" and such the name remained until 1676, when that name disappeared as did most of the vestiges of a Puritan settlement.[1] The order of the Commissioners declaring the disenfranchisement

[1] This action is very significant in the fact that the Puritans conceived that now they were in a position to carry out their original design and found the colony of "Providence" as a unit in itself. They had thrown off the Proprietor's yoke and a new Province was to be the result.

of Roman Catholics and the impossibility of their being protected within the Province was made a law. Happily this act was never rigidly enforced. Though for a time the Roman Catholics may have been disenfranchised, they were always protected. A bill was passed later in the session which shows the honorable nature of the Puritans. They declared all preëxisting debts to be valid. The Court and other records are, moreover, full of instances showing that when Roman Catholics came boldly into Court, confessing and upholding their creed, they were always protected in their civic rights.

Stone's Campaign Against the Puritans.

Governor Stone, as may be supposed, did not remain idle. He forwarded to Calvert a full account of the recent changes, and the Proprietor in turn presented a petition to Cromwell charging Bennett, now Governor of Virginia, with instigating a rebellion within his Province. Mr. Eltonhead, the envoy of Stone, returned late in the autumn of 1654, with letters from Calvert to the Governor and his late Council. Recognizing them as the true government, he reproved them for their cowardice in allowing a handful of men to dispossess them of their own and the Proprietor's just rights without a blow in defense. Stone was ordered immediately to regain authority by any means within his power, and if he should be afraid to do so, Captain Barber was named as his successor. Stone was no coward, especially where there was everything to gain and nothing to lose. A party of twenty armed men was sent to the house of Richard Preston, one of the leaders of the Puritans at Patuxent, where the records of the colony had been placed for safe keeping. These they obtained without difficulty, and with them a living index to the colonial history in the person of a young man, an unfortunate investigator of original sources, who alone perhaps was able to interpret the colonial hieroglyphics. Preston, by Stone's

order, was to have been brought in triumph, with the records, to St. Mary's; but he preferred to absent himself from this spectacle. The captors, laden with their spoil, returned to the old capital.

The Puritan Council, then at the Severn, sent messengers forthwith to St. Mary's to ask plainly by what authority Stone had thus acted, "which if he would show they would be satisfied." They continued, "for our own parts we affect no preëminence, but had rather be governed by the laws of God and lawful authority by him set over us, than that we ourselves should be placed in an employment, the nature of which in these times is above our abilities." To the messengers Stone made threatening answers. He declined to show his authority to them, but to others (as they afterward confessed), he declared that it came directly from Cromwell. The Governor now prepared for an attack upon the Puritan settlements and by force of arms to wrest his authority from them. All the country around St. Mary's was astir with excitement and with the preparation for war. Boats, men, arms, and provisions were seized and pressed into service. The party from St. Mary's started early in March and came up the Chesapeake. The boats cruised close to the shore and received supplies from a land contingent, which harried the country as it advanced. Farm houses were pillaged for food and ammunition; servants and negroes were impressed or enticed by promises of liberty. So slowly did the land force move, enjoying as they went the fat of the land, that they arrived upon the battle-field too late for useful service.

From every section the Puritans fled to the Severn, to the protection of the Council, and helped to swell the little army which prepared to defend their homes and "the liberties of Maryland." Some hid themselves until the hostile army had passed, but others were captured. Exaggerated reports of Stone's strength reached the Puritans, and they determined to send another message to him, when about half-way up the Bay, offering to surrender the government if guaranteed cer-

tain rights. These were to be: (1) the liberty of English subjects; (2) indemnification for the late trouble; and (3) liberty to leave the Province. If these rights were not granted, "we are resolved to commit ourselves into the hands of God, and rather die like men than be made slaves." This declaration was carried to Stone by six messengers, who came in a wherry belonging to the "Golden Lyon," a British bark then lying in the Severn. The men were seized and detained, and a messenger was despatched to the Severn, who read, by consent of the Council, a proclamation from Stone; but he was afterwards sent off, under surveillance, toward St. Mary's, as it was thought that his chief object was to spy out the land.

The Battle upon Severn.

A battle was now imminent, and the Puritans determined upon a vigorous defense. They seized, in due form, the English bark then lying in the river, demanding of the Captain, in the name of Cromwell and the Commonwealth of England, protection in his vessel "for the poor trembling women and children." A small New England fishing-smack was also seized in the same manner, and the Puritans collected from all quarters on the plantations of Fuller and Durand, where the meeting-house stood. During the afternoon of Saturday, March 24, Stone's forces, amounting to about 250 men, sailed in twelve boats into the Harbor, or the broad mouth of Severn River. The little fleet was led by a pinnace, Stone's own boat, over which floated the yellow and black flag of the Baltimore family. The English bark, before her arrival in the Severn, had stopped at St. Mary's, and while there had witnessed the great preparations for the local war. Stone was relying upon the English Captain's assistance in the struggle which was to come. Accordingly, when the boats entered the harbor, they made confidently toward the "Golden Lion," but a warning growl came from that monster

in the shape of a howitzer ball. Stone's party fled across the Harbor, where they landed, "their cursings and reveilings being heard for above a mile." Here the little army encamped and, having drawn their boats up the creek, unwittingly allowed themselves to be there blockaded by the energetic little fishing vessel, armed with a small six-pounder. According to their chroniclers, the Puritans that night gave themselves up to watching and prayer; but before dawn, Sabbath morning, they proceeded up the river and crossed, unobserved by their enemy, to a point six miles above Stone's encampment. Thence they marched down the peninsula and fell upon the St. Mary's troops, smiting them hip and thigh. Stone, finding himself cut off from retreat, his boats entrapped, and the "Golden Lion" menacing his rear, threw up earthworks and prepared for the worst.

The two historic forces of Maryland here stood opposed. Upon the fate of the coming battle Maryland history depended. In these two miniature armies we see but a colonial reproduction of the two forces which met ten years before at Marston Moor. The questions here involved were not merely of a religious nature, as so many hold; the great principles of self-government, individual liberty, and civic equality were causes for which the Puritans fought and died, both in England and in the small colony of Maryland. The fate of the battle of Severn was to determine whether the colonists of Maryland should endure or throw off the absolute authority of their Proprietor and his chosen Council; whether the "liberties of English citizens" were really to be granted to the colony or trampled under foot.

Stone's party was two hundred and fifty strong; drums were beating and flags were flying. The Puritans under Fuller numbered about one hundred. They had no drum, but the flag of the Commonwealth of England, borrowed from the English merchantman, floated from a staff above them. "In the name of God, fall on!" was the Puritan charge to battle. That of the St. Mary's men was "Hey for St. Mary's and

wives for us all!" The Puritan standard-bearer was the first to fall. As if stimulated by this loss to do their utmost, his Puritan comrades fell upon Stone's troops with great fury and valor, driving them from their intrenchments and carrying everything before them.[1] The Puritans' loss was six killed; that of St. Mary's, fifty killed and wounded; but all the rest save five or six were captured, together with much plunder. The victorious Puritans, with prisoners, boats, and booty, recrossed the Severn to Fuller's plantation, where the captives were confined in a stockaded fort, preparatory to a court-martial appointed for the next day. The court, composed of the council and perhaps others, condemned many of their prisoners to death, but only three were actually executed. The rest were saved by the intercessions of the women and by the refusal of the appointed executioner to carry out the sentence.[2] Captain Lewis, Mr. Eltonhead, and John Leggot were shot. Others were imprisoned or kept under guard for a month or more, and still others were fined and dismissed to their homes.

Puritan Supremacy Re-established.

Puritan supremacy in Maryland was thus again established. The story of the forfeiture of property on the part of Stone's adherents is almost without foundation. A careful study of court records convinces us that the punishments of the invaders were remarkably light for that age of conflict and retaliation. We should remember that the Puritans, if they had been the losing party, would have been exterminated and

---

[1] The field of battle is generally supposed to be the point opposite Annapolis, known as Horn Point. More probably it was the Peninsula upon which the city now stands. It was named by the Puritans "Papists' Pound," from the number of beads, crosses and other symbols claimed to have been picked up there.

[2] These last facts are taken from a report to Lord Baltimore by one of his adherents, Hammond, and hence are to be judged for what they are worth.

their wives and daughters would have fallen prey to Lord Baltimore's reckless followers. The estates of the defeated party were indeed seized for the time and put under the control of officers who were instructed to keep the same in perfect order until a fuller inquiry could be made into the losses occasioned by the devastating expedition from St. Mary's to the Severn. Many also who had joined Stone, believing his statement that he had authority from Cromwell,[1] were pardoned, also those who by threats were forced to join his party. Many petitions are recorded for indemnification for loss of boats "borrowed," for cattle and sheep stolen, and servants enticed away by Stone's men. The fines imposed by the Council were nominally to cover such losses.[2] Courts of justice were held regularly in all the counties. Sheriffs were appointed, in several instances from men who had but lately been in arms against the Puritan Council. Stone's influence with Lord Baltimore and his power in Maryland vanished simultaneously, and in his place the Proprietor commissioned, July, 1656, Josias Fendall, one of Stone's allies, as Lieutenant Governor, and five of his old adherents as a Council.

A Proprietary Governor and a Puritan Government.

The little province of Maryland now appears in history with two governments, Baltimore's Governor and Council and

---

[1] It appears that the year before, the commissioners had placed certain trusty men in charge of the fort at St. Mary's. These had surrendered the same to Stone and joined his army, believing that he had authority from Cromwell.

[2] A recorded list of all who were ordered to pay fines numbers thirty-seven; of these ten had their fines reduced, generally one-half; six were pardoned outright, and the rest probably paid. In almost every case of fine there is prefixed the expression, "to cover loss made by the late march." The fines were levied in tobacco, worth about $30 per 1,000 lbs.; but sometimes the order was to return stolen things, or build ducking-stools, pillories, &c., for their respective counties.

the Puritan Council, which in point of fact wielded the whole power. Three months after his appointment, Fendall was arrested by order of the Puritans, but was dismissed upon taking an oath of obedience and good behaviour. His futile attempts at regaining Baltimore's "just right and title" by the circulation of pamphlets, stirring up the religious sects against one another, and by intriguing with Indians against the whites, affords a good picture of the underhanded way in which his Lordship was trying to regain his province, while openly conducting peaceful negotiations in England with Bennett and Matthews, the Puritan commissioners. Providence, Kent, and Patuxent, as well as part of St. Mary's counties, were now in perfect sympathy with the Puritans and their form of government. Fendall's authority was so limited at this time that no public acts of his are even recorded. His spirits were kept up by frequent grants of land to himself and friends. The Proprietor did not forget the wives of those that had fallen in the battle on Severn.

Compromise with Lord Baltimore.

Meanwhile in England negotiations for a happy settlement between the two parties were in progress. Calvert, at the outset, had complained to Cromwell, and he referred the matter in dispute to his Lords Commissioners. In May, 1656, they made a report upon the question. This report was referred to the Board of Trade. After much delay these officers reported, as the only possible means of settling the dispute, a surrender of the Province to its Proprietor, upon certain concessions to the present holders, the Puritans. Bennett and Matthews, on the part of the men of Providence and the Puritan Council, drew up the articles, or conditions upon which the Puritans would surrender the government of the Province. In substance, these were very similar to those conditions proposed to Stone by the Puritan Council previous to the battle of Severn. These were signed by Lord Baltimore,

November 30, 1657. The Agreement was sent over to Maryland, where it was read by Fendall to his Council, February 27, 1658. Messengers were sent to Providence and Patuxent requesting the Puritan Council to meet Fendall and his council at a conference at St. Leonard's, March 22, 1658.

For the first time since they stood opposed in battle under their respective standards, the two contending parties met. In a large hall the rival governments sat and listened to the Articles of Agreement and Surrender which their friends in England had thought honorable enough in terms. "After the reading of Instructions, Capt. William Fuller and the rest of the commissioners propounded diverse other articles tending as they conceived to the quiet and welfare of the province, which admitted of some debate."[1] These articles were simply amendments, three in number, to certain phrases implying that surrender was necessary on the part of the Puritans, and that they were at fault in the whole matter. Two of these amendments were adopted and the document was then signed by all present. Perfect liberty and equality was all the Puritans desired. These points gained, they readily yielded up to Baltimore his province. Puritan connection, as such, with the government of Maryland from this time forever ceased. For eight years the reins of state had been in the hands of the Puritans. The necessary co-operation among all members of that body to maintain their position tended as well toward the preservation of their religious ideas. When in 1658 they yielded up their authority in temporal affairs, seeds of disunion in religious matters were sown.

Advent of the Quakers.

The peaceful times which follow seemed to be most fitting for the advent of the Friends into Maryland and into its history. Driven from Virginia as the other Nonconformists

[1] Council Records.

had been, several of the Quakers came up into Maryland and, though not tolerated by Lord Baltimore's officers at St. Mary's, established themselves among the Puritans of Providence and were there not only harbored but welcomed. Slowly and quietly they ingratiated themselves into favor with the Puritans, from whom they received sympathy and support. But the first measures of the restored government of Lord Baltimore were to organize the militia of the Province and to compel all persons to subscribe to the Agreement. In both of these orders the government found itself opposed by the Quaker element now rapidly increasing.

Philip Thomas, who had long dwelt among the Puritans, Thomas Thurston, and Josias Cole, all three Quakers from Virginia, and others who had petitioned the council to allow the Friends exemption from military duties and the privilege of affirmation for an oath, were put under arrest for addressing such a "presumptious letter" to the government. Thurston was easily found, but the sheriff returned "that Cole was at Annarundell seducing the people and dissuading them from taking the oath of Agreement." Justices, whom Fendall appointed for Ann Arundel County, declined to take the oath prescribed, "saying, in no case was it lawful to swear," and substitutes were appointed. The Provincial Court banished, imprisoned, fined, and whipped, but all to no purpose. Month after month the sheriff of Ann Arundel would notify the court "of certain vagabonds and seditious persons" in his county who refused to sit on juries, take the oath, or serve in the militia.[1] In the very centre of the Puritan colony of Providence, at West River, was built a house for the yearly meetings of the Friends, and in 1672, twenty-four years after

[1] In 1660, one John Everett, who had been pressed to go and fight Indians, refused and was arraigned on the charge "of contempt for running from his Collors." He pleaded for conscience sake that he could not bear arms. He was ordered to be tried, "in the meane tyme the said Everett to be kept in chaynes and heate his-own Bread."

their arrival in Maryland, we find George Fox lecturing to large assemblages in that very meeting-house which the Puritans in their original fervor had built, but which was now in the possession of another sect. Those who, ten years before, were the staunchest of Puritans, had now become zealous Quakers. This change of doctrine, although necessarily of slow growth, seems to have been wide-spread and to have affected the most prominent members of the Providence colony.

Fendall's Conspiracy.

Gov. Fendall took the opportunity when affairs in England, preceding the Restoration, were in an unsettled condition to attempt the overthrow of Baltimore's power in Maryland and establish himself as Proprietor. In this he was joined by many of Baltimore's trusted friends, who were either fascinated with the offers which Fendall made of lands and money, or who deemed themselves unjustly treated by the Proprietor and desired a change of masters. Fendall's plan was to resign the government into the hands of certain members of the Council and Assembly, who were in turn to invest him with power and form themselves into a Commonwealth of Maryland.

The second Commonwealth of Maryland failed to find that support in the new king Charles II. that the first had found in Cromwell. Orders were received from England to pardon those who had been led astray, but from this general amnesty Fendall and one or two of the Puritans were excluded; Calvert's revenge upon the latter had yet to be satisfied. He wrote, "yea, if there be need you may proceed against them by Court Martial Law and upon no terms pardon Fendall, so much as for life. No, if you can do it without hazarding the Province to pardon so much as for life any of those that sat in the Council of War at Ann Arundel and concurred to the sentence of death against Mr. Eltonhead or other of my honest friends murdered then and there, and who are engaged

in this second rebellion."[1] Fendall was pardoned; but Fuller was outlawed, proclaimed an incendiary and violent person, and compelled to live in seclusion until the storm had passed over.

Beginnings of Annapolis.

The plantations of Providence, though increasing and concentrating, were still scattered and unprotected. A letter from Mr. Lloyd, dated June 28, 1662, gives us some idea of the precarious conditions of the Puritans' homes by reason of Indian marauders. He said, "nightly whooping and shooting is heard and cattle coming freighted [frightened] home." Along the banks and at the mouth of the Severn River the farms were more numerous than elsewhere and gradually there, around their meeting-house, little homes began to spring up, the nucleus of the town of Ann Arundel or Severn—the Annapolis that was to be. The interest of these former rulers of Maryland in her welfare was unabated. Yearly the men of Severn petition that "the Laws of the Province may be inscribed in a neat, fair hand and sent to Severn." They made a strong endeavor to have the capital of the Province moved to Severn as a more central position and active neighborhood. Indeed, several offers were made by private persons from the county to build at their own expense a capitol and Governor's mansion, to be paid for when the people chose. These offers were declined, but they portray the growing importance of the Puritan settlement and prepared the people of St. Mary's for the change which would sooner or later follow.

Acts of the Assembly to encourage the building of towns caused several to spring up within the bounds of Ann Arundel, but all had lingering, short, feeble lives, and have left few traces of their existence. In 1689 Ann Arundel

[1] Council Records.

County was reported "as being the richest and most populous" of the whole Province, and the county seat upon the banks of the Severn began to assume some importance. Under the administration of Governor Nicholson in 1694, Severn received the name of "Annapolis." The irregular clusters of small houses gave way to regular streets and to government buildings. The quondam religious centre of the Province now became the political head. St. Mary's, shorn of its glory as a colonial capital, was slowly overrun by tobacco fields, and, in a few years, the town was dead. By the close of the century, fifty years from its settlement, the county of Providence stood at the head of Maryland affairs, but it was no longer Puritan. Its history now blends with that of the Province at large. Puritan characteristics become yearly less capable of recognition and the history of Puritan founders fades away from the consciousness of Puritan descendants.

Importance of the Puritan Factor in Maryland History.

Let us consider the importance of the Puritan foundation to the later history of Maryland. Those early but often effectual strivings for liberty in worship, in speech, and in government, which fill the Puritan annals of Maryland, were but local expressions of a great popular movement which was and is stirring the civilized world. This little band of Puritan exiles represented in Virginia and in Maryland what the Puritan masses represented in England in 1648; what the third estate represented in France in 1789; and what the revolutionary classes of all nations represent in their various uprisings, whether religious, political or economic. The desire of those who possess neither wealth, title, nor privilege, is to participate in some way in their own government and to resist oppression by a ruling class. That system of titled nobility, of manorial custom, of a landed proprietor over and

above all—a virtual king within his realm of Maryland—that system which Lord Baltimore had endeavored to establish here, the Puritans, with their democratic ideas and self-governing institutions, crushed to powder. Lord Baltimore had conceived of a great realm in Maryland, based upon feudal principles. He was to be its feudal lord. His dependents and favorites, with their vast tracts of land sub-let on feudal terms or worked by servant labor, were to form his feudal courts, enforce tithes and servile obedience. The Puritans of Maryland, like their brethren in England, resisted. When no regard was paid to their petitions, when rulers forgot their promises, they set their strength against royal, aristocratic, and oppressive institutions and overthrew them altogether. They built up a government for Maryland upon more thoroughly democratic principles. As Parliament resisted the tyranny of James I. and Charles I., so in the Assembly of Maryland we see Puritan antagonism to oppressive acts of the Proprietary and of his Privy Council.

Drift toward Democracy.

Perhaps at no time in its history did the Lower House of the Province of Maryland make such a desperate attempt to control the administration as in 1660. That branch then conceived that not only the law-making but also the judicial power belonged to the people and by their will was vested in the House of Delegates. This principle was upheld by Fendall, then Governor. The Council, much against their will, was compelled to sit with the Burgesses. This triumph was of course short-lived. The day of retribution for democratic audacity eventually came. Many times the Burgesses complained against the arrogance of the Council and against their own exclusion from the administration of the Province. Again, in 1661, the Puritan members of the Council resisted the establishment of a mint by the Proprietor, claiming that the prerogative of coining money belonged to royalty and did

not appertain to the powers of Lord Baltimore. But the act passed over their votes.[1] While the Puritans were in power they adopted a purely democratic system for legislation. The two Houses sat as one. Quaker principles increased this democratic spirit. Every man was to be a brother and an equal of every other. Those practices and theories, radical though they may have been, served an historical end; they curbed the growing tendency to concentrate the functions of state in an hereditary ruler and in his Privy Council,—the Proprietor and his appointees. Maryland always was democratic in law and to a great extent in fact; but the offices of Governor, Council, Provincial Court, Minor Court justices, sheriffs, bailiffs, secretaries, surveyors, and inn-keepers, were all within the appointing power of the Proprietor. Among the men of Severn, democratic principles had full sway. Thence they went forth conquering and to conquer the whole Province.

Political Parties.

The growth of political parties within the colony was not peculiar to Maryland. Virginia and New England each passed through the same phases and each fostered the growth of political opinion. The animating impulse of the seventeenth century was toward reform in church and state, toward religious and political freedom. Together Protestantism and popular rights struggled with Catholicism and absolute monarchy. The American colonies, the children of a common English parentage, imitated the mother state in all her phases of party strife. Party spirit did more for civil liberty among the North Atlantic colonies during the reign of the Stuarts and the Commonwealth than during the suc-

[1] For coining Maryland money Lord Baltimore was arrested by Act of the Council in England. His dies, stamps, &c., were confiscated in October 1659; but two years later he began anew coinage for Maryland and was not hindered by the English authorities under Charles II.

ceeding century. The old Anglo-Saxon spirit dominated in the new world as it did in England. The political ideas of Buchanan, Sidney, Milton, and that great favorite with American thinkers—John Locke—sprang up anew across the sea and developed new party life like that in the mother-land.

An Historical Parallel.

The parallel between the history of Providence Plantations in Rhode Island and in Maryland is most striking. As Roger Williams was driven from the mother commonwealth of Massachusetts for holding heretical doctrine, so Durand, the Puritan elder, was expelled from the mother colony of Virginia to seek a new home for religious toleration. Both leaders came to lands unoccupied save by Indians and invited their brethren to follow. Both called the land to which they came through Divine guidance, "Providence."